

Amy F. Sorenson, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 12495
Richard C. Gordon, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 9036
Holly E. Cheong, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 11936
SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 1100
Las Vegas, NV 89169
Telephone: (702) 784-5200
Facsimile: (702) 784-5252
asorenson@swlaw.com
rgordon@swlaw.com
hcheong@swlaw.com

Attorneys for Defendant Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

RONNIE CHI WAN, an individual,

Plaintiff,

vs.

PLUTE MORTGAGE LLC; WELLS
FARGO BANK NATIONAL ASSOC.; U.S.
BANK NATIONAL ASSOC.; AND DOES
1 THROUGH 100, Inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:14-cv-01619-RFB-CWH

**DEFENDANT WELLS FARGO BANK,
N.A.'S EX PARTE MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE A
RESPONSIVE PLEADING TO
PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT
(SECOND REQUEST)**

Pursuant to LR 6-2 and 7-5(c), Defendant Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (“**Wells Fargo**”), hereby requests a twenty-day extension of time for Wells Fargo to file a responsive pleading to the Complaint filed by Plaintiff. Wells Fargo’s response is currently due on January 13, 2015. The requested extension of time will make Wells Fargo’s responsive pleading due on February 2, 2015. This Motion is supported by the Declaration of Holly E. Cheong attached as **Exhibit A**.

Counsel for Wells Fargo spoke with the Plaintiff for this case on January 12, 2015. Plaintiff indicated that he was represented by counsel in this case but refused to give the attorney’s name or contact information. *See* Declaration of Holly E. Cheong, attached as **Exhibit A**. Plaintiff told Wells Fargo’s counsel that he would have his attorney call. *Id.* Wells Fargo’s

counsel spoke to Plaintiff again on January 13, 2015 and he again indicated that he is represented by counsel but refused to provide contact information for his attorney. *Id.* As Wells Fargo is prohibited from speaking to Plaintiff about the substantive matters of this case without his attorney's knowledge or presence, Wells Fargo was unable to negotiate a stipulation to extend the time to respond to the Complaint. Plaintiff is currently listed on the Complaint as having no representation and as a *pro se* plaintiff. If Plaintiff does have representation, ghost-lawyering is prohibited by the State Bar of Nevada. *See* State Bar of Nev., Standing Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility, Formal Op. No. 34 (June 24, 2009).

Wells Fargo has good cause for this ex parte motion as Wells Fargo has been unable to communicate with Plaintiff given his purported representation and unwillingness to cooperate by identifying his attorney. Wells Fargo has compelling reasons for this extension as it has no record of this loan and needs additional time to investigate the Complaint so it can accurately respond to the Complaint. Wells Fargo also needs additional time to discuss this case and potential settlement options with Plaintiff's counsel. No previous extensions have been granted.

Dated: January 13, 2015

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

By: /s/ Holly E. Cheong
Amy F. Sorenson, Esq.
Richard C. Gordon, Esq.
Holly E. Cheong, Esq.
3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 1100
Las Vegas, NV 89169
Attorneys for Defendant Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.

ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED:


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DATED: January 14, 2015